

all of the generic claims are not found to be patentable. With all due respect to the Examiner, given the fact that the Claims, which are the subject of the Election of Species Requirement are dependently written, it is not believed that the issuance of this Election of Species Requirement is particularly productive in terms of speeding up the examination of this Application.

Note also, that in order for an Election of Species Requirement to be proper, there must exist a patentable difference between the species. See MPEP §806.01(a). The Applicant expects the Examiner to use a consistent standard as patentability throughout the prosecution of this Application as set in this Election of Species Requirement.

The Applicants have made a provisional election as required by the Rules of Practice.

Also, the applicants point out that the generic claims, which the Examiner identifies in the Official Action is incomplete. For example, with respect to Claims 8 and 9, their generic Claims are Claims 1, 5 and 7. With respect to Claims 17 and 18, their generic claims are Claims 13 and 14. Finally, with respect to Claims 29 and 30, their generic Claims are 23, 25 and 27.

An action on the merits in this Application is awaited.

Response to Official Action
Dated March 9, 2006
Re: USSN 10/759,510
Page 3

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

March 27, 2006

(Date of Deposit)

Esther M. Hayes

(Name of Person Depositing)

(Signature)

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Berg

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 28,145

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300